

REMARKS

In the Paper mailed October 9, 2007, the restriction requirement identified two groups of inventions:

Group I: a copolymer as recited in claims 1 to 69;

Group II: a blend comprising a copolymer as recited in claim 70.

Applicant hereby elects, without traverse, the invention of Group I for immediate prosecution. Applicants reserve the right to file a divisional application based on the invention of Group II.

Additionally, the Paper required an election of Species and an identification of the claims readable on the elected species. Applicants hereby elects the Species as described in Example 151 and having the properties graphed in Figure 6. Additionally, Applicant believes the following claims are readable on the elected species, though Applicant makes no statement as to the exclusivity of this list and other non-identified claims may also be readable on the elected species: Claims 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 12-14, 18-19, 22, 24, 27, 28, 50, 58, and 62.

In the above restriction, the polymer disclosed in Experiment 1 of Powers (US 5286804) was noted as disclosing the copolymer of claim 7. As a preliminary comment prior to examination on the merits of the elected claims, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the interpretation of Powers. In Experiment 1, Powers discloses the copolymer of isoprene and isobutylene as a “conventional linear” copolymer. This is not the same as the recited “substantially free of long chain branching.” Powers conventional linear copolymer is, as seen by the parenthetical definition of Powers, a non-star branched copolymer. This is not the same as “substantially free”. A conventional linear copolymer has branching therein, just not as much as a star branched copolymer. Such a conventional linear copolymer is disclosed in Applicant’s own Example 150. Review of the g’ value and the properties of the Example 150 copolymer, as graphed in Figure 5, demonstrates that the copolymer has a small degree of branching – which, while being less than that of an intentionally star branched copolymer, is greater than the “substantially free of” long chain branching as recited by Applicant.

Applicant awaits prosecution on the merits of the claims. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney if there are any issues outstanding which have not been addressed to the Examiner's satisfaction or if there are other issues which the Examiner believes can be readily resolved via a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

October 19, 2007

Date

/Nancy T. Krawczyk/

Nancy T Krawczyk
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 38,744

ExxonMobil Chemical Co.
Law Technology
P.O. Box 2149
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149
Phone: 281-834-2429
Fax: 281-834-2495